

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 12 1827
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE
FAMILY OF JUDAH:

BEING A

THOROUGH EXAMINATION INTO AND COMPLETE REFUTATION OF

BISHOP COLENSO'S

FIRST OBJECTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY A LAYMAN.

LONDON:
WILLIAM FREEMAN, 102, FLEET STREET.

MDCCCLXIII.

[*Price One Shilling.*]

BS1225
A. C7F2

APR 12 1922
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE

✓
FAMILY OF JUDAH:

BEING A

THOROUGH EXAMINATION INTO AND COMPLETE REFUTATION OF

BISHOP COLENZO'S

FIRST OBJECTION TO THE PENTATEUCH.

BY A LAYMAN.

LONDON:

WILLIAM FREEMAN, 102, FLEET STREET.

MDCCLXIII.

[*Price One Shilling.*]

LONDON :
WILLIAM STEVENS, PRINTER, 37, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

P R E F A C E .

I N these times, when our Church is assailed by so many foes who, by taking, as they are pleased to term it, a *liberal* view of the Bible, are endeavouring to persuade us that it has worn itself out, that it is effete ; not suited to the advanced opinions of society, and are making a religion of their own for us, it behoves every man to examine for himself, “to search the Scriptures whether these things are so.”

This must be my apology, as a layman, for venturing upon what might almost be termed forbidden ground, and for presuming to take up a subject which should, more properly, be left in the hands of those who being, by virtue of their office, the exponents, are therefore the real defenders of our religion.

At the same time I know of nothing which should prevent any man in or out of orders from giving a “reason for the hope which is in him,” and the more so, because, although I am given to understand that some answers to Bishop Colenso’s work have already appeared from the hands of clergymen, yet none of them (as far as I can make out, for I have not read them, and therefore I speak only from hearsay,) appear

to take up each objection of the Bishop's separately, but content themselves with a general denial and refutation of the whole book. What, therefore, is really required in the absence *at present* of any such work is, a thorough examination into each separate objection of the Bishop's, and a complete answer thereto. We want no fresh works on the Pentateuch, for its authenticity is fully established beyond all doubt (notwithstanding any assertion to the contrary); what we do want is completely to refute from its pages and its own sacred words, the errors of those who from time to time take exception to any and whatever part of it.

This is especially necessary at the present time, for our weaker-minded brethren—astonished, perhaps, at the fact of a bishop boldly asserting the Bible to be wrong, and seeing no such attempt at refutation made, and not satisfied with a mere general statement that the Bible is right and the Bishop wrong—may, perhaps, be led to the conclusion that his assertions are unanswerable, and his objections, even though only tolerably yet to some extent, well-founded.

The friends of the Church, who would naturally prefer to see the subject taken up by professed ministers of that Church, are reminded that this pamphlet is not intended to supersede any such work that may issue from their hands, it is only a stopgap, as it were, for the present; and I cannot bring myself to believe that while Bishop Colenso's work is in full career, and spreading mischief and distrust abroad, they will raise any objection to the humble attempt here made at even

a feeble refutation of any part of his work, though it is only a layman who is presumptuous enough to enter the lists against him.

I have heard it said that it would be a waste of time to attempt a condemnation of that which condemns itself,—that is only partially true. No person would care to notice an attack on the Bible by an obscure individual; but the case is altogether different when a bishop ventures his reputation, and perhaps his position, by writing the Bible down, and boldly asserting that it is not to be depended on. There is something in that which, from the horror we feel, and the blow it deals to all our hopes, should lead us to pause before we conclude that it is wasting time and trouble to refute him. On the contrary, if we believe the Bible to be true, that is surely not waste of time, or useless expenditure of labour, which by deep and careful research, will tend to strengthen that conviction on our own part, and enable us to persuade others, and prove to them its truth beyond all doubt. For myself, I *am so* convinced, and feel persuaded that the Bible is God's gift to us sinners; that it reveals to us His dealings with men in all ages; that it is the revelation of His will to man for all time; that it contains everything necessary for man's guidance through life; leads him by the actions of a well-spent life to hope for immortality in the immediate presence of God; warns him of the full consequences of a bad life; shows him in whom to trust under all the circumstances of his earthly pilgrimage; is his comfort in all afflictions; soothes his fears, dispels his doubts, calms

his troubled spirit ; supports him by its promises ; cheers him by its hopes, and gently guides him through this vale of tears to the haven of everlasting rest. Believing all this, I as firmly believe that no weapon formed against it *can* prosper.

With these views, therefore, though with great diffidence in my own powers, acting by no advice, seeking no profit, anxious only to defend the cause of God and truth, I venture to intrude this short pamphlet on public notice, in which only the first objection in Bishop Colenso's work is combated, with the intention of following it up each fortnight, if it meets with approbation, until the whole is completed. And I have adopted this mode, first, because my daily avocations leave me but little time for writing, especially where much thought and labour are required, as on so important a subject as this ; and, secondly, because a pamphlet in this form, containing, as it does, the Bishop's charges *in full*, with a refutation of each of them, is by its price within the reach of everybody : especially of those who, not being able to afford the purchase of his work, depend in a great measure upon what they hear ; and, though in general friendly to the Bible, are led to form opinions upon the subject, mainly in accordance with the prejudices of those to whom they listen, (which may or may not be inimical to the truth), rather than upon a careful and impartial view of both sides of the question, with the Bible at hand for reference.

May the blessing of God accompany this feeble attempt to defend His truth.

INTRODUCTION.

NEITHER this pamphlet, nor those which will follow it, profess to give a history of the Pentateuch. I leave that (if it be necessary), in the hands of abler men. These introductory remarks, therefore, would be superfluous, if it were not that I wish to notice the efforts of a small party in the Church, who seem anxious to do away, not only with the Pentateuch, but with the Bible itself. Hitherto those who have attacked the Bible systematically, have been for the most part out of the Church; and if any one in it of its ordained ministers has ventured to call in question the truth of God's Word, it has been done either in secret, or has been treated with indifference. It has been reserved for this age of wonders to produce a party in the Church, headed now by a Father of that Church, who openly question the veracity and authenticity of certain parts of the Bible, and consequently of the whole; for quotations in the New Testament by our Saviour, and his Apostles in their Epistles, are so constantly made from the Old, that one part depends almost entirely upon the other. Nor are these new opinions thus thrust so prominently forward, set on one side by the

laity, as once, perhaps, they would have been, owing to the high position of their respective authors—men whose names carry such weight with them, that they cannot be treated with indifference, and accordingly their works are read with avidity, and devoured with eagerness.

Many regard the matter with a certain degree of curiosity on account of its novelty ; some, doubtless, are thunderstruck at its audacity ; others, hankering after something new, are disposed to fall in with the new views propounded ; and others, always weak in faith, and always vacillating, are now almost forced to give up the Bible altogether, so bewildered are they by the opposing principles brought to bear upon them. The enemies of the Church look on it now with derision, and laugh at its perplexities. It is no new thing, indeed, for them to see divisions therein on points of doctrine ; no new thing to behold angry strifes caused by different views on a certain text or texts of Scripture ; but it is quite a new thing for them to see a bishop and distinguished men in their calling stand up, and by their writings endeavour at once to overthrow the whole fabric of religion, and to take away altogether the foundation on which it is built—viz., the Bible.

No wonder, then, if the friends of the Church view the attacks made upon it with indignation and alarm ; not, however, that they feel any fears as to the final result, for well they know God's truth will triumph over all its enemies, but because such an inroad tends to spread in the meanwhile infidelity

and indifference among all classes, which no efforts of theirs will be able entirely to prevent.

Yet truly it *is* a hard thing that, under pretence of spreading the truth—or, as Bishop Colenso says, because he feels it his duty in the service of God and the truth—we find, on a sudden as it were, all our trust in the Bible, if we are to believe what these men say, completely shattered; that what we have been accustomed to believe, and our fathers before us, as the true undoubted Word of God is nearly all a fabrication; and that what we have been taught to receive and regard as written by men directly inspired of the Holy Ghost, turns out to be untrue, unauthentic, and valueless.

What, then, are we to do? which creed are we to take to? Shall we at once make short work of it and give up the Bible, or shall we stick all the more closely to it because attempts are made to take it away from us? Shall we, the laity, halt for the present between the two opinions of those who in the Church adopt the Bible and those who do not, and wait to see the result of the conflict, or shall we at once take a side—*the* side, *the true* side, the *only* true side? Who is on the Lord's side; who? Shall we suffer ourselves to be borne about on a sea of uncertainties, carried hither and thither, we know not where, by the winds of doubt, tossed up and down, up and down, by the waves of unbelief, until we find ourselves at last overwhelmed in the deep dark waters of despair? or shall we continue to do as we have hitherto done—sail gently down the calm river of a trusting faith, wafted safely and surely on-

wards by the soft breezes of a confident hope, borne up on the placid bosom of the waters of love, until we are brought to anchor at last in the haven where we would be?

And where shall we find the best method of doing this—in the Bible, from whence we extract the promises we love, the hope we build upon, the faith we cherish, or in these new doctrines, which take all these precious things away and leave nothing in their place that we either know or can trust to? No, no! “*Thy* word is a light unto my feet and a lamp unto my path:” good men may write about it in terms of commendation, comment faithfully upon it, and uphold it manfully against many enemies; but even what they may say is fallible, however good; is not faultless, however faithful; but *Thy* Word continues infallible, unalterable, the same from everlasting to everlasting.

Bishop Colenso says, “Our belief in the living God remains as sure as ever, though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible were removed.” Quite so. The devils believe and tremble, and they have no Bible. But I humbly ask him, then, if there is no need of the Bible at all? I am told therein that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is *profitable* (mark the word) for doctrine, reproof, correction, *instruction* in righteousness. Am I only to believe, then, in the living God and tremble, as the devils do; or am I to follow on to know the Lord? Is my belief in Him to consist in merely that “He is,” or am I to look up to Him with all the loving, earnest, humble, hoping confidence of a son in his

father—his heavenly Father? Am I to be a slave or a son, anxious—oh, how anxious!—yet dreading to approach Him; wishing, but yet afraid, to love? Be sure God would not have given us the Bible if it had not been necessary; we have it only because He knows we have need of it.

How, then, shall we be certain of its truth? By never doubting that it comes from Him; remembering this too, “that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation; for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” There are no cunningly-devised fables therein; no stories of man’s invention; no words of mere fallible man’s writing; but, to quote the words of the Bishop from Burgon, who says, “the Bible is none other than *the voice of Him that sitteth on the throne*. Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the word of God—not some part of it more, some part of it less—but all alike the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the throne—absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme.” “Such,” says the Bishop, “was the creed of the school in which I was educated.” Better, far better, “not to have known the way of righteousness, than after having known it to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto him.”

We have no reason, then, for fear. The truths of the Bible have been assailed in all ages, but it has fared never the

worse. There will always be those whose paths lead to destruction, who, as enemies to all righteousness, will ever do their utmost (limited, thank God!) to set aside the Bible; and always those who, going about to establish their own righteousness, will not submit to the righteousness of God. But the word of God standeth sure; and that word, communicated to us by direct inspiration from Him, shall last for ever, unmoved amid all the wreck of time, unshaken by all the efforts of its enemies; alone unerring through all the errors which prejudiced men will seek to fasten upon it, and unbroken amid all the successive waves of rage, unbelief, hatred, and indifference which unavailingly dash themselves against its base: it is as the house founded on the rock, *and that rock is Christ.*

THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

BISHOP COLENSO begins his work by saying, that the books of the Pentateuch, in their own account of the story which they profess to relate, contain such remarkable contradictions and involve such plain impossibilities, that they cannot be regarded as true narratives of actual historical matters of fact; and he commences with the family of Judah as the first example.

Gen. xlii., v. 12.—“And the sons of Judah; Er, Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah: but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. And the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul.”

From which passage, he says, the writer here means to say that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan, and were among the seventy persons, including Jacob himself, and Joseph and his two sons, who *came into Egypt* with Jacob.

The words are repeated again and again.

V. 8.—“These are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt.”

V. 26.—“All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob’s sons’ wives, were

threescore and six ;” which they would not be without Hezron and Hamul.

V. 27.—“ And the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls : all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten.”

Exod. i. 1, 5.—“ These are the names of the children of Israel, *which came into Egypt* ; every man and his household *came with Jacob*. And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls : for Joseph was in Egypt already.”

Deut. x. 22.—“ Thy fathers *went down into Egypt* with threescore and ten persons ; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude.”

He assumes then, that it is absolutely undeniable that the narrative of the Exodus distinctly involves the statement, that the sixty-six persons “ out of the loins of Jacob,” mentioned in Gen. xxvi., and no others, went down with him into Egypt.

He then goes on to show, that Judah was *forty-two* years old when he went down with Jacob into Egypt, and that in the course of those forty-two years, the following events are recorded to have happened.

Judah grows up, marries a wife at the age of twenty (which time is accounted for by the words of Gen. xxxvii. 12, which say, “ at that time,” *i.e.*, after Joseph’s being sold into Egypt when he was seventeen years old, Judah being older than Joseph by three years), and has three sons separately by her.

The eldest of these three sons grows up, is married, and dies.

The second grows to maturity, suppose in another year, marries his brother’s widow, and dies.

The third grows to maturity, suppose in another year still, but declines to take his brother's widow to wife.

She then deceives Judah herself, conceives by him, and in due time bears him twins, Pharez and Zarah.

One of these twins also grows to maturity, and has two sons, Hezron and Hamul, born to him before Jacob goes down into Egypt.

All this being certainly incredible, he concludes one of the two accounts must be untrue. Yet the statement that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan, is vouched so positively by the many passages above quoted, which sum up the seventy souls, that to give up this point is to give up an essential part of the whole story.

This, then, is the first difficulty on which the Bishop grounds his charge of the unauthenticity and untruthfulness of this part of the Pentateuch. And I am bound to say, that a cursory glance at the subject, as he has laid it before us, would lead us to adopt his views, whilst a thorough examination into them shows their utter groundlessness, and proves the truth of the sacred narrative.

It would appear that he is not the only one whose attention has been directed to this particular point—the descent of Jacob into Egypt. Many commentators have written upon the subject, and the result of their labours, as given to the world, shows that many, if not all, have expressed the same views, and are unanimous in their solution of the difficulty; but the Bishop regards the arguments of these learned and able men as so much special pleading, so many shifts to avoid confessing the actual truth; as being so feeble and unsatisfactory that the writers themselves had no faith in what they wrote, but felt that, “in order to maintain at all costs the veracity and authenticity of every portion of the Pentateuch,” something *must* “be said to dispose of such

contradictions as those we are here considering." It would have been well if, before making so sweeping a charge against such respectable authors, he had bestowed a little more pains upon the answers he has vouchsafed to make to their explanations, or he would hardly have been betrayed into the glaring inconsistencies which are manifest in all parts of his work, or laid himself open, I had almost said, to the charge of ignorance of the contents of the sacred volume.

In the course of these remarks upon the family of Judah, I shall have occasion often to refer to the "explanations of expositors," and the Bishop's replies thereto; and however feeble and unsatisfactory they may be in his opinion, I doubt not but that I shall be able to show that they are more fully to be relied on as careful, well-considered, and thoroughly examined arguments, in favour of the narrative as it stands, than the loose and hasty answers which have been bestowed upon them by the Bishop.

I shall proceed at once, therefore, to a consideration of the sacred text; and in addition to those upon which Bishop Colenso relies as the main support of his objections, I shall draw attention to the 6th and 7th verses of the 46th chapter of Genesis. The words are these:—"And they took their cattle, and their goods, which they had gotten in Canaan, and came into Egypt, Jacob, and all his seed with him. His sons, and his sons' sons with him, his daughters, and his sons' daughters, and all his seed brought he with him into Egypt."

No notice whatever has been taken of these words by the Bishop, except a mere glance at them in one of his answers; and yet they may be considered to contain the gist of the whole matter, for they tell us at once who went down, and how many, into Egypt.

First, then, who went down?—Jacob and all his seed.

Now, observe the word “seed” is mentioned not once, but twice; first *generally*, then *particularly*; generally in that it includes at once *all* his family; particularly, in that it draws a distinction, as we shall show, between seed sprung up and seed unborn.

The very meaning of the word “seed” is that which has been or is to be sown, but not yet brought forth; and though in the sense of posterity it often, in the Bible, may include living issue, it is most frequently applied to future descendants.

Though hardly necessary, let me select a few examples:—

Gen. xv., v. 3.—“And Abraham said, Behold, to me thou hast given no *seed* ;” and again, “Know of a surety that thy *seed* shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs.”

The expression “*their seed after them*” is often used in the sacred writings, as when God saith unto Abraham, “I will establish my covenant with him” (Isaac) not yet born, “and his *seed* after him.” Judah, whose case we are considering, said unto Onan, “Go in unto thy brother’s wife and marry her, and raise up *seed* unto thy brother.”

With regard to the righteous, “His soul shall dwell at ease, and his *seed* shall inherit the earth.”

“Wherefore then serveth the law? it was added, because of transgression, till the *seed* should come to whom the promise was made;” and once more, “My Spirit shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy *seed*, nor out of the mouth of thy *seed’s seed*, from this time forth for evermore.”

These suffice to prove my position, if such proof were needed; but, as the subject more particularly relates to Jacob and his seed, I may be permitted to adduce those examples which will in some measure supply me with an argument, which I may require as I proceed.

When Abraham, then, was on his journey from his country and kindred, he came to Sichem, and the Canaanite was then in the land. And the Lord appeared unto Abraham and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land." And again God brought him forth abroad and said, "Look now toward heaven and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them;" and he said, "So shall thy seed be." In Gen. xvii., v. 28, God says again to him, "I will give unto thee and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger." Here, then, are three clear and distinct promises made to Abraham, not only when he had no living issue by his wife Sarah, but when from her age there was no prospect of it.

In due time, however, Isaac was born, and in Gen. xxvi. the promises made to Abraham were renewed in him when God says, "I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven: and I will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" and again, v. 24, "The Lord appeared unto him and said, Fear not, for I am with thee, and will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake." Jacob at this time was alive, but as he was the only son Isaac ever had to whom the blessing belonged, the seed was still in the womb of futurity.

To come to Jacob. When he was sent away by his mother, through fear of his brother Esau, on his journey, God appeared to him in a dream and said, "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac. The land whereon thou liest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed." Here the seed is still to come, Jacob being at that time unmarried. Thus, then, it will be seen that the word "seed," as is in fact its primary meaning, refers more especially to those who are yet to come.

It may, and does often in a general sense, include the living issue, but it must necessarily involve those yet unborn. Strictly applied, the word means descendants *ad infinitum*, though those who are already born may be represented by the term.

Having thus briefly explained the word "seed," I shall proceed to show how far the texts I have quoted will bear the interpretation.

I have already observed that the word is used twice; first generally, as in the words "Jacob and *all* his seed," which includes at once all Jacob's family, whether born or unborn, within a certain limit mentioned in the narrative; and then particularly, for it appears to me to draw a distinction between those at present living and those still to come. It says, "his sons and his sons' sons, his daughters and his sons' daughters who were living, and then all his seed brought he with him into Egypt."

Now, I think these words clearly establish a marked distinction between the living and the future seed, for the general statement would have quite sufficed for all historical purposes. If the writer had not intended to convey such a meaning, he would have contented himself with closing that part of his narrative at the end of the 6th verse, and not troubled himself with a repetition which was needless by continuing it in the 7th, especially as he follows it up by an enumeration of all the souls who accompanied Jacob in his migration. But he has thought fit to draw our attention to it as furnishing, in the words of Havernick, "the *completest* list of Jacob's family."

Now, on this point, I must trouble the reader with a remark of Kurtz, and the Bishop's answer to it, which I shall show to be utterly untenable. Kurtz says, "In Gen. xlvi., v. 5, where there is no question of genealogy, and the individuals emigrating are described from a historical point of

view, we read not of the *grandchildren* of Jacob's sons, but merely of their *children*, who are described as little ones." This is the answer: "Kurtz should have written 'but merely of their little ones,' for there is nothing said about their being only 'children'—they might be children or grandchildren. If it were necessary to give any further reply to so feeble an argument, we might say that the expression 'little one' is used of Benjamin, Gen. xliv., v. 20, when he must have been more than twenty-two years of age, since he was born before Joseph, at seventeen (Gen. xxxvii., v. 2,) was sold into Egypt, and Joseph was now thirty-nine, and he remembered his brother tenderly. In fact, Benjamin, according to the story, had actually ten sons of his own, possibly by more than one wife, and yet he is called a 'little one.' Hence full-grown sons, such as Pharez and Zarah, might be included in the expression 'little ones,' as well as their children. Again, in Gen. xlv., v. 7, we read 'his sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters, and *all his seed* [the words are italicised by the Bishop] brought he with him into Egypt. Accordingly, in verse 17, we have two grandchildren of Asher—Heber and Malchiel."

To this I reply that, inasmuch as the Bishop insists so much upon a close adherence to the texts on which he founds his objections, he cannot be angry with me if I adopt the same principle. Whatever Benjamin may have been called in Gen. xlv., by a brother twenty years older than himself, and whose father was upwards of a hundred years of age, that has nothing to do with Gen. xlv., where he is numbered among the *sons* of Israel, who took their *little ones*. Nor when he uses the words "all his seed" has he any right to assume that it was in existence. The words used carry a marked distinction; for first it is said the *sons* of Israel took their *little ones*; then it describes the "*little ones*" as sons' sons and

sons' daughters, who were all living ; then it concludes the enumeration with the seed who were yet to come. He has not shown that Asher's grandchildren were really living. He knows well enough that Pharez and Zarah were not more than four years of age, if so much, and that consequently they could have had no children at the time of the descent into Egypt, and the feebleness of his own argument is clearly shown by the following fact :—

Admitting that Asher's grandchildren were not seed, but actually born, and that Judah's grandchildren were so likewise, how does he get over the fact that the *grandsons* of Benjamin are likewise enumerated in the list of those who went with Jacob into Egypt? Benjamin was about twenty-six when he went, and was not a father of ten sons (as the Bishop erroneously states), but actually a grandfather ; for Ard and Naaman, mentioned as his sons in Genesis, are recorded as the sons of Bela, the son of Benjamin, in Num. xxvi., v. 40, and in 1 Chr. chap. viii., v. 3 and 4. Yet they are included in the number of the seventy who accompanied Jacob. Are we, then, to suppose that Benjamin, at twenty-six, or even at thirty, was a grandfather? and yet, how could Ard and Naaman have gone with Jacob? Certainly not in person—most assuredly as “seed” yet to come. May I not reasonably infer therefrom that Asher's and Judah's grandchildren were yet future?

Either the Bishop was ignorant of, or has overlooked the point. If ignorant, he has no right to sit down and write a book about the inaccuracies of the Pentateuch. If he has purposely overlooked it, he renders himself amenable to the charge of want of candour ; but in either case, no one, I think, would be disposed to pay much attention to his arguments.

This one fact of Benjamin entirely overthrows all his

objections, for if the sacred writer intended (as in Benjamin's case is evident) to include all those in his list who came into Egypt as "seed," the difficulty vanishes at once with regard to Hezron and Hamul. For as Benjamin's grandchildren could not by any possibility have been alive at the time of the migration, neither is it at all necessary to suppose that Judah's were.

But I will ascribe it to the Bishop's ignorance, for I cannot believe that a man holding his position, would purposely be guilty of concealment of the truth, or he would hardly repeat his statement, about which there can be no mistake.

In answer to a suggestion made by Pool, that the verb "were" in the sentence, "and the sons of Pharez *were* Hezron and Hamul," is emphatic, and surely marks a distinction, and implies that the sacred historian deliberately intended to except those two names from the remainder of his list, the Bishop says—"Whoever will accept the above explanation, must explain as before, why these two grandsons of Judah, together with the two grandsons of Asher, are included among those who went down with Jacob into Egypt, whereas *no other of the great-grandsons of Jacob are mentioned in the list*. This surely indicates that these four—and these four only—were supposed to have been born before the descent into Egypt."

After this, is further comment necessary?

These remarks might fitly be closed here, but I prefer, even at the risk of being troublesome, to carry them on, and show as plainly as I can, that the Bishop has erred in other respects. I wish to prove how *inconsistent* he is in his objections.

I think my readers will agree with me, that sufficient has been adduced to demonstrate that the view I have taken with regard to the word "seed," is not forced, and that in

fact it must necessarily involve those who were yet unborn. But it may be asked, how far does it extend? Seed is a very wide term, and may comprehend posterity *ad libitum*. The Bible, however, leaves us no room for doubt, for it both limits and enumerates the seed. It says, "Jacob and all his seed;" "and all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten."

From these words, I hope to be enabled to prove that these were all the persons born during Jacob's lifetime, and that it included all the souls of the children of Israel at the time of his death.

Now, no one but Bishop Colenso would doubt this, and I presume he does, by the following answer to a remark of Hengstenberg, "Who," says Kurtz, "solves the difficulty on the ground that the grandsons and great-grandsons of Jacob, though not yet born, were *in their fathers*, and therefore entered Egypt with them." Here is the answer, which would excite laughter, if it did not rouse our indignation. The Bishop says, "Why not also the great-great-grandsons, and so on, *ad infinitum*?" Now I ask, does this deserve the name of an answer? Is it worthy of even the ingenuity of a child? I take it, that any one reading Hengstenberg's argument in connection with Jacob's descent into Egypt, would at once perceive that he was referring only to the seventy persons enumerated in the list, and no others, and yet he is met with a querulous quibble. Was the Bishop himself so ignorant of the plain facts of the narrative, which not only limits their number, but records their names, that in order to give some answer, he felt he must give others the credit of ignorance also? To what can we ascribe so extraordinary a statement, which is actually repeated, though in different words, when he asks, on the same subject, "Why does the sacred writer draw any contrast between the seventy persons

who went down into Egypt, and the multitude, as the stars of heaven who came out, since these last, as well as the former, were all in the loins of their father Jacob?" But did Jacob *see* any of these last? The narrative says "they," "threescore and ten persons, went down *with Jacob* into Egypt;" so I presume that Jacob *saw them all*; but did he see any of the 600,000 men who left Egypt more than 200 years after? And when this contrast is drawn, it is done not so much for the sake of comparing the seventy persons with the 600,000 men, in point of numbers, more than for the purpose of urging these last, so stiff-necked and perverse, to a more implicit obedience to that God, who in Deut. x., v. 21, "hath done for thee these great and terrible things which thine eyes have seen," and had performed and was performing, those promises which He had made to their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The whole of that chapter, with the previous and the following ones, is nothing more or less than a continual recounting of God's mercies towards them, and directions as to how they should conduct themselves towards Him; and has no bearing, not even by way of contrast as to mere numbers, upon what we are considering. It is, therefore, out of place, and the Bishop has no adequate reason for adducing it.

Seventy persons, then, went down into Egypt as living issue and seed; but are we therefore to suppose that they included all Jacob's immediate descendants, *i.e.*, those born during his life, wherever born? I believe so, and for the following reasons: First, that inasmuch as Benjamin's grandsons were born in Egypt, probably Asher's, but most certainly Judah's, we need not suppose, to use the Bishop's own words, "that any children were born to Jacob's sons in the land of Egypt, if the plain meaning of the Scripture will not allow us to suppose the contrary." Here, then, he at once admits that

the number of seventy, in the absence of any authority to the contrary, were all the souls that had come out of Jacob's loins at his death; for though he will not allow that any were born in Egypt, he does not dispute that that number included all those, and those only, who were alive at Jacob's death; for the question, by Kurtz, which he answers, is—“Are we to suppose, then, that no children were born to Jacob's sons in the land of Egypt?” Ah! but what is become of the contrast? What of the “Why not also the great-great-grandsons, and so on, *ad infinitum*?” I am bound to admit, however, that the Bishop has found an exception, for he continues—“There was, however, Jochebed, the *daughter* of Levi, who is not numbered with the seventy souls in Gen. xlv. and whom it is expressly said her mother bore to him *in Egypt*.” True; but during Jacob's life? Now, Jochebed was the mother of Moses and Aaron; and Moses was born very nearly 120 years after Jacob's death: and I read in the Bible, that Sarah at ninety—how much more Jochebed, at 120, if born during Jacob's life—ridiculed and laughed at the idea of being a mother. The words of Abraham, who himself was incredulous, are—“Shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old; and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?” I think even the Bishop now must give up Jochebed. But he mentions other great-grandsons, besides those in Genesis, who are given in Numbers as Eliab, the son of Palla, the son of Reuben, a son of Manasseh, three sons of Ephraim, and Zarah the twin-brother of Pharez, the son of Judah, who had a son called Zabdi, Jos. vii. 6; and four other sons besides, in 2 Chr. ii., v. 6. But with respect to all these, he has not brought forward the least shadow of proof to show that they were born during Jacob's life. Is it not a great deal more probable that they were born after? or why should not the sons of the twin-brother of Pharez be entitled,

equally with the sons of Pharez, to a place in the enumeration? We shall, however, refer to this point again. A second reason for believing that this number of seventy included all Jacob's immediate descendants, *i.e.*, those born during his life, is from the circumstances connected with the generations of Jacob.

The generations of Isaac are not recorded until after the death of Abraham; nor the generations of Jacob until after the death of Isaac. The genealogies of Jacob's sons are given during his life, and after his death, without any variation whatever. Exodus commences with these words—"Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his household came with Jacob; Reuben, Simeon, Levi," &c. Then it states distinctly, "that all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls, for Joseph was in Egypt already;" and concludes, "And *Joseph* died, and all his brethren, and all that generation." Now this can hardly be said to be a mere recapitulation of Gen. xlv., for it will be observed, that Jacob is entirely done with; and it was Joseph who died (not Jacob), and all his brethren, and all that generation. And it will be observed, moreover, that while in Genesis it says, "These are the names of the children of Israel which came into Egypt, *Jacob* and his sons," thereby *including* Jacob, in Exodus it commences with the names of the sons at once, thereby *excluding* Jacob, but yet making no variation in the numbers who with him went into Egypt. The family, at the death of Jacob, therefore, had received no increase. On this subject, the only answer the Bishop can make, because he is at a loss entirely, and, as one would say, altogether at sea, is no appeal to the direct words of Scripture,—*viz.*, "All the souls *which came with Jacob* into Egypt were threescore and ten." But we have conclusively shown from Scripture, that some

(as in Benjamin's case), went as "seed," which, whilst it in no way militates against the sense of the sacred text, deprives the Bishop of all standing-ground whatever.

But there is a third reason, from which, I think, we may be allowed to draw certainly a reasonable inference, if not conclusive evidence, on this point.

The sacred historian is giving a description of the settlement of the *children of Israel* in Egypt, and of no one else, not even of Jacob himself. Mark, that it is in both places, "These are the names of the *children of Israel* which came into Egypt;" and in the first quotation, Gen. xlvi. v. 8, it is Jacob who is included among his children. It was the sons of Israel who carried their father; though, in order to give Jacob the respect due unto him as the head of the family, they all went with him. So again, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons." The fathers were the sons of Jacob, the original progenitors of the different tribes, and Jacob is included only as being the common father of all. It was necessary for Jacob to go into Egypt, in order for the fulfilment of God's word to Abraham, when it is said, "Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them." Isaac, Abraham's seed, was expressly commanded *not to go* into Egypt, Gen. xxvi. v. 2; but Jacob, Isaac's seed, was commanded to go, Gen. xlvi., v. 3 and 4; for there God would make of him a great nation. But let me examine this subject a little more closely;—and for that purpose I would ask, "Who are really the seed here meant?" Not Isaac, nor even Jacob, for this reason: Abraham was the original possessor of a direct blessing from God, on himself and his seed. When Abraham died, Isaac inherited it from his father, as will be seen by reference to Gen. xxvi., v. 2, 3, 4, where God says to him, "Sojourn in this land, and

I will be with thee, and bless thee, for unto thee and thy seed [still the seed] will I give all these countries." Jacob did not inherit the blessing until Isaac's death, when God appeared to him in a dream, and said, "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest to thee will I give it, and to thy seed," (still the seed.) So again, as an angel, he wrestled with Jacob, and "blessed him there." There is, therefore, a strong line of demarcation to be drawn between Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the seed. He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and of their seed, only through them. Although, therefore, Jacob went of necessity with his seed, because he could not be left behind, and was commanded to go, he must be separated from his seed, and placed with Abraham and Isaac as the original fathers of *the seed*. We infer, therefore, from all this, that the commencement of the real sojourning of *the seed* began *after the death* of Jacob; and as he went down with seventy persons, and no others are anywhere mentioned as being born during his life, that was the number of his descendants at his death.

At the risk of being troublesome, I will venture yet a fourth reason in support of my argument.

Joseph's sons, though born in Egypt, yet came down in this number *with Jacob* into Egypt. I should not have adverted to this point at all, but that I wish to notice a glaring inconsistency in the Bishop's answer. It appears that Hengstenberg has noticed it in these words:—"All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were *seventy souls*." Now, since Joseph's sons are numbered with the souls which came down to Egypt, because they, though born in Egypt, yet came in their father thither; with equal propriety might those grandchildren of Jacob be reckoned, who came thither in their fathers. This reason is irrefraga-

ble. The Bishop does not think so, for he answers it thus :—
 “But evidently the sons of Joseph are not reckoned with those who went down into Egypt with Jacob, because *they went down in their father*, but because they were born there, or rather were living there, were in Egypt already, at the time of Jacob’s migration. The description is, of course, literally incorrect, but the writer’s meaning is obvious enough. He wishes to specify all those out of the loins of Jacob who were living at the time of the commencement of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, and from whom such a multitude had sprung at the time of the Exodus. Otherwise, as said above, why has he mentioned grandchildren only of Judah and Asher, and not of the other sons of Jacob, as, for instance, the grandsons of Levi? [I have shown that grandchildren of Benjamin are mentioned also]. In point of fact, in the writer’s view, Joseph himself had not gone into Egypt till his father went. He had been carried down as a captive many years before, but from this time dates his true migration into Egypt when his father settled there, and he and his sons shared in the sojourning of the children of Israel.” Now, Bishop Colenso will not be angry with me, if I humbly request him to adhere closely to the *strict letter* of the Scripture. He will not allow for a moment but that Hezron and Hamul went down *personally* with Jacob into Egypt, because the Bible says so. With equal justice, therefore, did Manasseh and Ephraim, because the words are, “All the souls of the house of Jacob, *which came* into Egypt, were threescore and ten,” thereby including those two. How, then, did they go down personally, or in their father, when he went down—*whenever he went*? personally, we know they could not have accompanied Jacob, because they were in Egypt already; it follows, then, they must have gone down in their father as seed, even when he went as captive, if the Bishop has no ob-

jection, for the words are distinctly, "*they came into Egypt.*" It is of no use to tell me the description is literally incorrect, though the writer's meaning is obvious enough; I return the argument upon his own head, for if in the case of Ephraim and Manasseh, though alive at the time, the description is literally incorrect, whilst the meaning is obvious enough, the description in the case of Hezron and Hamul may be the same, though we can easily discover what the writer intended to convey. If, too, he wished to specify all those out of the loins of Jacob who were living at the time of the commencement of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, he would not have mentioned the grandsons of Benjamin, who could not possibly have been born at that period; and who yet, with the grandsons of Judah and Asher, went down with Jacob into Egypt.

A fifth and last reason, I trust I may be allowed to give, which is this: that with exceptions in the cases of Levi and Manasseh, and Ephraim, the list of those who accompanied Jacob into Egypt, as compared with the enumeration of those who were *heads* of families in their respective tribes, when the census of the children of Israel was taken in Numbers, two hundred years after, is identical: no new names are introduced, though some are omitted, as I suppose, having had no family or issue. In Reuben's case the genealogy is carried on; but Eliab, the son of Pallu, the son of Reuben, gives his name to no family, and is only mentioned as the progenitor of Dathan and Abiram, whose wickedness and history is briefly repeated there. It is difficult to understand why Eliab should have been excluded from the privilege of giving his name to a family in the tribe of the eldest son of Jacob, unless we conclude that he was born after Jacob's death. Only those born during Jacob's life seem to have been entitled to this honour; it is most probable, therefore, that he was

not so born. With regard to the exceptions, the cases of Ephraim and Manasseh are entirely different from all the other grandsons of Jacob, inasmuch, as whilst that Patriarch was still alive, he claimed them as his own, "as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine;" that is, as Scott remarks, "they should be fathers of tribes," not heads of families merely; and that if Joseph begat any subsequent issue, "they shall be called after the name of their brethren in their inheritance;" *i. e.*, they should have part in the inheritance of Ephraim and Manasseh, and be incorporated with their tribes, and be heads of families therein. This peculiar blessing attached to them, will be a complete answer to another reply of the Bishop's to a remark made by Kurtz, "that there are no grandsons mentioned in Numbers besides those given in Genesis," on which he says, "There are great-grandsons mentioned, such as Eliab, the son of Pallu, a son of Manasseh, and three sons of Ephraim," whose names he gives, and concludes,—“Moreover, Zerah, Judah's other son by Tamar, had a son Zabdi, Jos. vii. v. 1, who is not mentioned in Genesis, but appears in 1 Ch. ii. v. 6, under the name of Zimri, with four other sons of Zerah.” I should almost regard this latter statement as conclusive, for, as we have noticed above, as the sacred writer has enumerated the sons of Pharez, *the twin brother* of Zerah, he would certainly have included any sons Zerah might have had before Jacob's death, especially as no reason is anywhere adduced for what one might be disposed to term so extraordinary an exclusion.

Thus, then, I have shown who went down into Egypt—Jacob and all his seed; that that *seed generally* included *all* his family born or unborn; that *particularly* it distinguished between those born and unborn, within a certain limit. We have seen that that limit is the threescore and ten persons who accompanied Jacob, and who were, from the date of his

death, the total number of his descendants—*all*, in fact, that immediately came out of his loins. I have disproved the Bishop's assertion that only the grandsons of Judah and Asher are mentioned, by showing that Benjamin's grandsons are among the number, though not born when Jacob went into Egypt; and I have disposed of many of his answers as inconsistent, not only with the Bible narrative, but with his own remarks thereon. What remains, therefore, is but to show, in conclusion, that as Benjamin's grandsons, though not born at the descent into Egypt, are numbered among the three-score and ten souls who went into Egypt with Jacob, so it is not necessary to believe that Judah's grandsons, Hezron and Hamul, were born in Canaan, as is insisted on by the Bishop of Natal. But it would appear that the Bishop is not clear even upon the point of their being born during Jacob's life in Egypt. "For," says he, "since Jacob lived seventeen years in Egypt, Judah was fifty-nine years old at the time of his father's death. Hence, if he was twenty years old at his first marriage, he must have been about twenty-four years of age at the birth of his third son, and thirty-nine at least, if we suppose that son to have arrived at maturity at the early age of fifteen. Thus only twenty years of Judah's life would remain even on this supposition (which however the texts quoted will not allow) for Judah to marry again, and to have *two grandsons* born to him by this second marriage." Now, I would ask the Bishop if he has never heard, even in England, of married couples having a child every year? At all events in eastern countries, in those days, it appears to have been nothing uncommon. It appears to have been the case with Leah herself in the first four years of her marriage; and if so, supposing Judah marries at twenty, before twenty-one he would have a son, before twenty-two a second, before twenty-three a third. He need

not, therefore, have been twenty-four years old—nay, barely twenty-three. Now, as Bishop Colenso will allow us to take fifteen (Benjamin must have married very early, as we cannot suppose him to have taken several wives *all at once*, if, as Bishop Colenso says, he was the father of ten sons at the going down into Egypt) as a matrimonial age, Judah was thirty-five at the marriage of his first son, and only thirty-six at the marriage of the second to the same wife, who was *to wait* until the third came of age to marry her, but she did not, and went home to her father. Some time elapsed, however—say another year, Judah being then thirty-seven—when she deceived Judah herself, and had two sons when Judah was thirty-eight, leaving thus twenty-one years to be accounted for in which he might be a grandfather of two grandsons, which is by no means uncommon even in England. There is not the slightest shadow of a reason for doubting the possibility of such a thing, and therefore it affords the strongest proof that, mentioned as going down with Jacob into Egypt, they went down as “seed,” as probably did Asher’s grandchildren, but most certainly Benjamin’s: But the Bishop, as I understand him, cannot get out of the words “*came into Egypt*,” “*went down into Egypt*,” which are used in Genesis and Deuteronomy, and as Stephen expresses himself before the Council, “So Jacob *went down* into Egypt and died, he and our fathers.” I presume that he will have no objection to my treating them as synonymous terms. But what did they go down for? In Is. lii., v. 4, I read these words—“For thus saith the Lord God, my people went down aforetime into Egypt to *sojourn* there:” and again Stephen, Acts vii., v. 6, says, making a quotation already noticed from the Pentateuch, “God spake on this wise, that his seed should *sojourn* in a strange land.” We have endeavoured to show already that the real *bonâ fide sojourning* of the *children* of

Israel did not commence until after Jacob's death, inasmuch as the dispensations of God with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are totally distinct from his dispensations with their seed. They, as the common fathers, stand aloof as it were by most peculiar and direct blessings from God, whilst their seed was blessed *in* them. If, then, the sojourning of the children of Israel did not really commence until after the death of Jacob, I do not see (even omitting the consideration of the word "seed") why so much stress should be laid upon the words "*came and went down into Egypt.*" This view of the question would therefore give the following result, viz., that the *children* of Israel began their sojourning in Egypt with sixty-nine persons, all living, Jacob being omitted as dead. This would not militate against their coming *with Jacob* as "seed," but only shows that this was the number alive at his death. In fact, the children of Israel could not be said to have commenced their sojourning in Egypt, as really *the children of Israel* or Jacob, until their *father was dead*.

Thus, then, I have endeavoured to show the groundlessness of Bishop Colenso's first objection to the historical veracity of the Pentateuch as regards the narrative of the descent into Egypt, and Judah's family as connected therewith. I do not see that any contradictions exist, as he insists upon. Even supposing, in his own words, that the description *is* literally incorrect, the writer's meaning is obvious enough. But I do not admit even this. I feel sure that only a careful study of the narrative, and painstaking comparison of scripture with scripture will make what at first sight may appear difficult, not only easy, but perfectly in accordance with truth, reconcile all seeming contradictions, clear away the mist that makes us look at any portion of God's word with a prejudiced eye, and make the way perfectly plain before our face.

If, without this study, we sit down to make haphazard ob-

jections to the sacred writings; if we endeavour merely to find out difficulties, without even attempting to solve them; if, too, by able and learned men those difficulties are solved to the satisfaction of all those who make it their duty to examine them thoroughly, and who have convinced themselves that such solution is neither forced nor prejudiced, and in perfect accordance with truth and the written word of God; if we are still not only unconvinced, but unwilling to be convinced, then we may truly be said to be given over to a reprobate mind, and the wrath of God will come upon us to the uttermost.

